

2-26/74

The Watergate Caper- Mae Brussell in The Realist 8/71⁶ HW

Two or closer to three weeks ago Bud Fensterwald told me that Freed of Cric (approx) had been in to see him (which I fear may be an indication of the discrimination of Freed et al and the direction they may, unfortunately, take).

The thing that impressed him, as it did me when he told me, about the old Tackwood story is that a year ago Tackwood had been given names for a venture similar to this caper and that these two names have been associated with the caught crew. Mae uses but on in her story, not the second. It was then as she describes it, but with less exaggeration in Bud's version, which preceeded this writing. I asked for tapes or transcripts that I could use and Bud had Freed's word only.

He knew I was in touch with the papers on this, did nothing of which I know to get these tapes, so I've had to leave it there. But with two Washington papers both asking me for information and leads, I suppose we may have lost something.

Frankly, I wonder more and more about the new people in the field who don't look me up either by phone or mail or when they are near. I haven't Freed's address and I doubt if I'd have written with all I can't get to do. I fear that with such excesses the benefit that could have come from the solid-seeming work you first sent me will be lost, and with the Krassner-Brussell exposure credibility will be undermined in the major media.

There is always the question with informants, can they escape the conditioning of their pasts, which requires embroidery upon the truth. However, when Tackwood gave two names a year in advance, that has a certain amount of inherent credibility.

I started reading Mae word for word last night, resumed this morning just skimming. I dozed over it last night and may have missed a bit. I am up to 5. on p. 35 and will resume after this because there is not yet enough daylight for what I'm working on. However, the farout is not always farout, just exaggerated. Example, and I think you referred to it, middle col. 1 p. 32, Young Republicans at Dallas. Stripped of her verbiage and wierd and excessive interpretation, the Dallas part is factual. I don't know how she got it. She could have stumbled on it is she was doing any Archives work or what is more likely, could have been told about it by one of those who has or read COUP. I have the whole story there is a chapter titled "The Dick Rubbers" (They were going to "rub the President's dick in the dirt" in the words of one of a series of reports I got. The Commission entered some of the reports as exhibits and then removed them, explaining with the lie that ^{no} such numbers were used. I have copies of the reports with these exhibit numbers affixed. As I remember, one was Exhibit 710. I also remember that a couple of years after I let him have a copy of COUP that he appears not to have taken time to read, Bud once turned to me with exultation and exclaim, "Well, Happy Harold, we finally have something you don't have!" ("We" have yet to give or show me a single documents "we" have gotten from the Archives.) Great, I said, what? Exhibit 710, Bud said, so I told him he hadn't read COUP. There were others on which I'm not clear. PH and I worked together on this. It was not the Dallas Young Republicans, it was the unit from a college at nearby Denton. ...It got to be a bit too much. I skimmed the pretended analysis and filed the whole thing under Mae rather than in the bugging file, to which it adds naught. But I am glad to know what is proceeding out there and to have seen how they are handling things. I knew of her new Krassner connection from a visitor about month ago. Thanks, H.